

REMARKS

The allowance of claims 1 - 9 and 15 - 20 and the indication that claim 14 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, set forth in the Office Action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, is acknowledged.

By the present amendment, claim 14 has been rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of base claim 13 therein and claims 12 and 13 have been canceled. However, while claims 13 and 14 have been rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, in that the Examiner contends that there is insufficient basis for the limitation of "said destination information" in line 11 of claim 13, with the Examiner indicating that this rejection can be overcome by deleting "said" in line 11 and replacing with --a--, applicants submit that the rejection of claims 13 and 14 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, is in error. Applicants submit that claim 13, in lines 6 and 7, recite the feature of "means for receiving from a communication terminal, a transmission request including destination information" (emphasis added) which provides antecedent basis for the later recitation in line 11 of claim 13 of "said destination information". Thus, applicants submit that the rejection of claim 13 and therewith claim 14 as lacking antecedent basis for "said destination information in line 11 of claim 13 is in error and should be withdrawn.

By the present amendment, claim 14 has been rewritten in independent form without amending claims 13 and 14 in a manner as suggested by the Examiner since claim 13 is considered to be in compliance with 35 USC 112, second paragraph, and claim 14, as written in independent form is also considered to be in compliance with 35 USC 112, second paragraph. Thus, applicants submit that claim 14, as rewritten

in independent form should be considered to be in compliance with 35 USC 112, second paragraph, and should be considered allowable at this time.

Further, by the present amendment, claims 12 and 13, which stand rejected over cited art under 35 USC 102(a) as set forth in paragraph 9 on page 4 of the office action and over cited art under 35 USC 102(e) as set forth at paragraph 10 of page 6 of the office action, have been canceled such that the rejections should be obviated and discussion of the cited art in relation thereto is considered unnecessary.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, applicants submit that only allowed claims 1 - 9 and 15 - 20, and objected to claim 14 which has been written in independent form and is considered to be in compliance with 35 USC 112, second paragraph, remain in this application and such claims should now be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, issuance of a notice of allowance is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in the fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to the deposit account of Antonelli, Terry, Stout & Kraus, LLP, Deposit Account No. 01-2135 (Case: 520.38867X00), and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP



Melvin Kraus
Registration No. 22,466

MK/jla
(703) 312-6600